WILSHIRE'S

"LET THE NATION OWN THE TRUSTS"

Vol. XVI No. III NEW YORK & LONDON, MARCH, 1912 Price 2 Cents per Copy

The Socialist Victory in Germany

IN 1907, when the Socialists went back from 81 to 43 votes in the German Reichstag, notwithstanding having polled a largely-increased popular vote, there was a shout all over America that Socialism was dead. The Press declared that the result could bear no other interpretation.

In the present election, when instead of emerging with 43 votes the Socialists have become the largest party in the Reichstag with 110 votes, and their popular vote shows a gain of 979,899 and a total of 4,238,919, the Press still parrots that Socialism itself is really dead, but that the Germans merely vote the Socialist ticket in order to express their admiration of the American system of democracy as opposed to the Kaiser system.

It is said that if those voters were living here in God's Own Country that they would be all good Republicans or good Democrats, and never, never Socialists; at any rate, not the kind of Socialists who vote for the present "miscalled" Socialist Party, as Roosevelt calls it.

The "Outlook" claims that German Socialism is merely a sublimated Roosevelt policy, and it quotes with approval some of the "immediate demands" of the German Social-Democratic Party platform, inferring that these planks are their fundamentals. As a matter of fact, the German Social-Democratic platform is practically identical with that of the American Socialist Party platform. The two parties are at one in their aim—the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth.

The fundamental literature of the two parties is the same, and both send their delegates to the same International Socialist Congresses.

If Roosevelt thinks that his Progressives are merely "good and sane" Socialists like the German Socialists, I would suggest that he try and send delegates of the Progressive Party to the next International Socialist Congress.

Of course, there are certain demands of the German Socialists, like that for universal suffrage and shortening the hours of labor, etc., which all progressive parties everywhere agree upon, but to say that such an agreement means that the German Socialists are merely Progressives is absurd.

As a matter of fact, the National Liberal Party, but more particularly the Radical Party, in Germany embrace what in this country we would call the Progressives, and they are the very parties which, in this election, have suffered most.

History will repeat itself in this country. The Roosevelts, the Woodrow Wilsons, and the La Follettes may possibly build up a Progressive Party out of the ruins of the present Republican and Democratic Parties, but they will do so merely to feed the future Socialist Party, which is bound to swallow all such Radical parties just as the German Socialist Party is swallowing the German Radicals.

There is no room in this country for any length of time for three parties. There will be one party which says the wealth of the country shall be owned by the workers, and one party which will try and keep it in the hands of the capitalits. The days are numbered for a Progressive Party which can successfully straddle the problem by making the workers think they are getting the wealth and at the same time make the capitalists think they are keeping it. That day passed when Bryan failed to show us that Free Silver would perform that miracle.

Bryan was far more plausible and convincing with "silver" than La Follette can ever be with "regulation." Free Silver at least pretended that wages would be raised somehow, but "regulation" merely promises us a dull future of a curbed Trust with certain profits which now go to steel, oil, and sugar being diverted to the smaller merchants and manufacturers.

Under the competitive wage system the whole of the product except the necessary living expenses of the workers must go to the capitalist class. To-day the Trusts are getting a larger share of the swag than the smaller capitalists think is their due, and they have chartered La Follette as pilot to help them "regulate" the stream more their way. They might as well try and divert the Mississippi from the Gulf of Mexico.

No doubt they will get a considerable number who are disgusted with the old parties to help them pull their chestnuts from the fire, but they cannot expect the working class to be for ever burning its fingers for the sake of the other classes.

Although the German Socialists have increased their seats held in the Reichstag, nevertheless they lost a dozen seats. It is significant that all these seats were held by the so-called "one step at a time" Opportunist Socialists—Roosevelt Socialists.

The German Party is fundamentally a revolutionary Socialist Party, as is the American Party, and yet neither is so foolish as not to take any half loaves that may be picked up on the way to the final goal provided the picking means no delay.

Roosevelt on Suffrage

That woman suffrage will soon reach the importance of as live a political issue in America as it is now in England seems inevitable. If more evidence is wanted, the fact that Roosevelt has broken forth upon it in the "Outlook" is sufficient. Teddy always has his ear close to the ground, and when he barks you may be sure that some issue is approaching camp.

The following is quoted by the New York Correspondent of the "Daily Telegraph" of London, with the remark that "all this is a repetition of the usual Rooseveltian platitudes, but the public here likes to read the ex-President's homilies, and an amazing number of Americans continue to consider them direct messages from on high."

I think it would be well to let women themselves, and only women, vote at some special election as to whether they do or do not wish the vote as a permanent possession; in other words, this is peculiarly a case for a referendum to those most directly affected—that is, the women themselves.

In our Western States, where the suffrage has been given to women, I am unable to see that any great difference has been caused as compared with neighbouring States of similar social and industrial conditions where women have not the suffrage. There has been no very marked change in general political conditions, nor in the social and industrial position of woman yet; what slight changes have occurred have been for the better, and not for the worse. Men and women alike must withstand the wicked folly which places the gratification of mean tastes and ambitions and the thirst for vapid excitement above the high happiness which can come only from a life of worthy effort spent with full and glad performance of duty as its first object.

The vice and folly of men and women which lead to the divorce court or take shape in the curse of voluntary sterility are fundamental evils of prime capital importance. The ruin of motherhood and childhood by the merciless exploitation of the labour of women and children is a crime of capital importance. Any tendency to permit a man to shirk his duty as the breadwinner, as the keeper of a household who owes his best effort to his wife and children, is an evil of capital importance.

Roosevelt, in the foregoing, while seemingly pretty well on the fence as to woman suffrage, is obviously against it to anyone who reads the least between the lines.

In the first place, there is no chance on earth of any practical method ever being evolved of taking a referendum vote of American women on the suffrage. If women waited for that event they would never get the vote, and Teddy knows it.

Secondly, it is illogical to ask women to declare, or men either for that matter, whether they should have a right to a say. The very fact that you ask them is your confession that they have the right quite irrespective of what their answer may be. If you should take a referendum of the women on a matter of such prime human import as woman suffrage, why not take their referendum upon such trivial matters as the question as to whether Teddy or Taft shall be our next President?

Thirdly, Teddy knows, as does everyone else, that with the present state of woman's opinion on suffrage, particularly in the South, that a vote of the women themselves would be most probably adverse to woman suffrage. But why should a majority, merely because it is a majority, have the right not only to enslave itself but the minority as well?

He says that woman suffrage has had slight effect in the West, where it has been tried out, although he admits that whatever effect there has been is good.

If we took results as a guide regarding manhood suffrage, then I fear that the men of New York and Chicago would not be able to show why they should retain their right to vote. It is not because men and women can run a State better when they are possessed of the ballot than when not that the suffrage is given, but it is because all men and women are units of the body politic, and unless we all have a medium of expressing what each of us wishes not only does the individual suffer, but the body as well. Suppose your finger was being crushed, and there was no nerve connecting the finger with the brain to let it know that it was suffering, not only would the finger be disabled, but the body also to the extent that a finger is useful to it. Suffrage is a nerve for the State, and if it does not work properly so much the worse for the State as well as for the unit not having a voice. Take away the nerves altogether from a man and you have a paralytic, no use to himself nor his members.

What "withstanding the thirst for vapid excitement" has to do with suffrage I don't know, unless Teddy thinks that the women thirst for the mere excitement of voting. True enough for most men voting, like art, is an end in itself; but even so, why deny women their share of the fun?

Nor do I see why Teddy considers that suffrage for women would make divorce or voluntary sterility any more of a dilemma for "men and women" than at present—not for men, anyway.

As for the "ruin of motherhood and childhood," if he had called it a crime of capitalism as well as of capital importance he would have shot nearer the mark, and he would have also indicated how women by voting against capitalism might help abolish the crime.

And why does Teddy talk about "permitting a man to shirk his duty as breadwinner"? Does he mean to infer that women are going to vote all men into the leisure class? If not, then what does he mean, anyway? Poor platitudinarian politician!

Try again, Ted.

In Competitionville

"Saturday Evening Post"

You live, perhaps, in a good, typical American country town. Passengers alighting at the railroad station are met by two or three dilapidated, dirty and uncomfortable hacks, any one of which will haul them to a hotel for a dime. Discriminating passengers would prefer to pay fifteen cents and ride in a clean, swift motor 'bus. There is business enough to support one such vehicle; but, if Hackman A bought a motor 'bus and made ever so little profit, Hackman B would at once set up a competing 'bus, insuring a loss to both. So passengers ride in a lurching, unclean hack.

Inquiring as to a hotel, the passenger learns there are two or three, all considerably run down at the heel and barely making a living. One really good hotel, getting all the business, would prosper. Three competing hotels give the traveller little pleasure and the proprietors no profit. The passenger learns there are four dry-goods stores; but the wives of the local merchants, lawyers, and doctors do most of their shopping in a bigger place, fifty miles away. Their own town might support one store as good as that which they patronise at a distance; but, of course, it cannot have such a store if the local trade is divided by four. There are thirty or forty or fifty automobiles in town and as many more in the surrounding country; but for certain repairs and supplies the owners go to the bigger place, because there are two or three competing public garages and no one of them can afford to lay in a complete stock and equipment, as a single public garage with a monopoly of the local business might well do. . . . . If his inquiries extend further he discovers that ambitious young men and women generally leave for a bigger place as soon as they are able, because everything is already overdone at home.

There is another side. A great many people do manage to make a living in your town; but competition's blessings are of a limited and relatively meagre nature.

An Official German Reply to Roosevelt

ARE THE GERMAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS REALLY SOCIALISTS?

By J. KOTTGEN (London Correspondent of "Vorwaerts")

The remarks on the German elections that appeared in the "Outlook" of January 27 for the illumination of the American people make some extremely amusing reading. At first I did not know whether to weep or to laugh over this exhibition of abysmal ignorance and self-assurance; but soon laughter carried the day. Imagine a writer who, either wilfully or ignorantly, caricatures the demands of the German Socialists by sandwiching some political and economical reforms demanded by all progressive parties between the abolition of plural voting and gratuitous burial (!), calling this hotch-potch the Social-Democratic programme. A simple reference to the Erfurt programme, which has been acknowledged by every one of the 900,000 men and women who contribute regularly to the party funds, might have shown him the real nature of the German Social-Democratic Party. On another page (presumably) the same writer says: "The German has no special love for revolution as a game, and he has not much faith in voluntary organisation, like trade unions, as have the English and Americans."

Considering that Germany contains at the present moment more trade unionists than any other country in the world, and that the organisation of the German trade unions is regarded to be so perfect that the British workmen are sending their leaders across the North Sea in order to study the German system of organisation, the "Outlook" writer can scarcely be said to be a reliable authority on Germany.

It would be a weary and unprofitable business to go seriatum through all the gross blunders and misrepresentations to be met with in the magazine named. The whole puerile exhibition would not be worthy of criticism if it were not intended to spread the idea in America that the German Social-Democratic Party is not a Socialist party, but merely a party of progressists who are out to obtain for Germany the same civil liberties which are said to be enjoyed by the English and American peoples. The statement is as old as the Party itself, and it is only natural that it should be assiduously propagated by the governing classes of every country now that the German workers have demonstrated the possibility of the proletariat conquering the political power and using it for remodelling society to their heart's desire. In Germany our enemies are accusing us one day that we have lost all faith in our Socialist ideals, that we no longer hope to reach our final goal, that we do not talk and write half enough about our intentions, and that we are merely a kind of Radical people's party; the next day they depict us to the public as the most violent revolutionaries, intent upon turning everything topsy-turvy, who should be outlawed. These political manœuvres, which serve the purpose to dishearten and bewilder new recruits, or to frighten the timid, are too thin to be taken seriously, and the best foreign observers of German politics have long ceased to pay any regard to them. Undoubtedly there are some German Liberals and Radicals who honestly believe that the Social-Democratic battalions are but the somewhat misguided auxiliaries of the Progressist army, and that with the greater advance of democracy in Germany Socialist ideas will tend to disappear from the programme of the Party. These pettifogging politicians, whose principles consist in the abnegation of principles and whose chief concern is to oust their Conservative opponents from the favour of the Government, are constitutionally unable to conceive a political party following steadfastly the broad and straight road leading to social transformation. They resemble those village oracles who, in the beginning of last century, used to explain to the assembled countrymen that the steam-engine which ran snorting through the country must have a horse hidden in its inside. There is no Radical or Liberal mare hidden in the Social-Democratic steam-roller that is flattening out all opposition to Socialism in Germany.

However, the statement that the German workers are simply fighting for the democratization of their native country has an alluring ring. For various reasons the German middle classes never succeeded in getting hold of the machinery of government as they did in Great Britain. Historical study seems to suggest that the next step in the evolution of the German Empire must be the introduction of more democratic institutions similar to those existing in Great Britain and America. But it must not be forgotten that democratic institutions may mean very different things in different countries. The German middle classes can never hope to lead the German working class by the nose as the British and American working classes have been led by Liberals and Tories, Republicans and Democrats. The introduction of more democratic institutions into Germany would not mean a bourgeois democracy, but a Socialist democracy. And that also explains the protean nature of our Liberals and Radicals: their heart tells them to follow the democratic traditions of their forefathers; but their reason leaves them in no doubt as to the results of a democratization of Germany.

Moreover, the German Social-Democratic Party is not out for social reformation, but for social transformation. And although quite naturally supporting any reform measure brought in by its opponents which may alleviate the distress of the people or advance popular government, the Party has always recognised and held the final goal, the socialization of the means of production for the benefit of the people, can only be reached when the proletariat has conquered the political power. The "Vorwärts," the chief daily newspaper of the German Party, published a leading article on this theme ("Our Final Goal") on January 28, 1912. The concluding remarks of that article were:—

"But it is just for that reason—i.e., the adoption of the policy of Imperialism by the governing classes—that the certainty is growing in our ranks that the question of the final goal is becoming more and more the practical question of proletarian politics. That is not to be taken in the sense that our political practice is becoming different. Now, as before, and at all times, all our comrades, however different the answer they may give to this question, are using all their power to obtain reforms, and are doing the work of the moment with all perseverance. But the very rapid development of capitalism has created all the conditions necessary for Socialism. To-day production has already been socialized. Only this socialization has been effected in favour of a small group of the very rich. To replace these by society, that is, to-day, not a question of economics, it is a question of the political power of the working classes. But that power the proletariat acquires through the consciousness of its mission, and it is just the capitalist policy of the most recent times, the policy of Imperialism, with its dangers and pressing burdens for the masses of the people, that causes the recognition of the necessity of Socialism to spread with ever-increasing rapidity. . . . But we know that Imperialism can only hasten on the fate of capitalism, and what to them (the Imperialists of all shades) appears to be a way to safety, appears to us as the last desperate *flight*. We know that we are sure to meet the opponent in this blind alley, and that is why we are again nearer to our final goal."

The above may be taken to be the view generally held by the members of the German Social-Democratic Party. There are, naturally, differences of opinion existing among the four and a-quarter millions of men over 25 years of age—not to speak of the millions of women and young men—who identify themselves with our Party; but these differences of opinion are as nothing compared with the differences existing between the Social-Democratic Party and the other non-Socialist parties. The Social-Democratic Party of Germany is out for Socialism, and hopes to be the first to achieve it. And this hope seems to be fully justified by the last electoral success. It is this success, which is bound to have a powerful influence on the development of the other divisions of the International Socialist army, which induces papers like the "Outlook" to throw doubt on the genuineness of German Socialism.

"Champ Clark says he thinks Taft is hurting himself by talking." Champ knows how it is himself.—"Richmond News Leader."

It might be a good thing if the decline in prices on the Stock Exchange would hit the provision market.—"St. Louis Globe-Democrat."

Established 1900

WILSHIRE'S MAGAZINE.

Published Monthly by
Wilshire Publishing Co.,
Room 213, 123, Liberty Street,
New York City.

GAYLORD WILSHIRE,
Editor.

Subscription, Post Paid to any address in the World, 25 cents per year.

GAYLORD WILSHIRE.....*President.*
H. R. KEARNS.....*Vice-President.*
WM. H. LEFFINGWELL.....*Sec'y and Treas.*

Entered at the New York Post Office as second class matter.

London Office GOLDER'S GREEN, London, N,W.

Vol. XVI. MARCH 1912. No. 3.

Strikes and General Strikes

The days of effective strikes against individual employers are fast passing on account of the superior organization of the employers.

The only strike to-day that is of any account is one where the public is made the sufferer rather than the employer. If the men can make the public sufficiently uncomfortable to induce Government interference in their favor, then a strike is likely to be to their gain.

But it must be remembered the industries whose stoppage means much public discomfort are largely limited to coal mining and transportation. Once the men in those industries are made satisfied with the terms of their employment, then the use of a general strike as a weapon to redress the evils of the present social system is at an end. It is utopian to look for the coal miners or railway workers to come out to help other strikers if they themselves are satisfied.

There is no economic reason why the owners of both the railways and the coal mines cannot pay their men wages high enough to satisfy them, and then recoup themselves by raising rates against the general public. This, no doubt, will be done in the future, and then we will see a kind of aristocracy of Labor established among the workers in mines and on railways that will not be likely to succumb to the song of the strike agitator.

Strikes are a good thing to set the workers' brains working and to increase their solidarity, but they can never hope to be more than a means of bettering wages. As for accomplishing the co-operative commonwealth by a general strike, that is an insane idea.

Nevertheless, there can be no doubt but that a general strike would educate the workers more in a month than anything else could ever do in fifty years.

High Prices and Gold

Prices of all goods to-day are much higher throughout the world than they were ten years ago. There have been all sorts of theories to account for this, but there is no denial of the fact.

In Protectionist countries like our own and Germany and France the tariff has been blamed, notwithstanding the tariffs are no higher now than they were before the rise in prices.

Trusts have also come in for the blame. England, not blessed with either tariff or Trusts, has settled down to the theory which I myself hold—namely, that the cause lies in the decreased cost of production of gold.

The "Appeal to Reason," however, scouts the gold theory, and says the trouble is that the "private owners demand more profits than formerly satisfied."

Why they should have suddenly grown more grasping all over the world at once is not said.

"Price" is merely the expression of the relative value of an article compared with a fixed given quantity of gold.

The "Appeal" says "the price of a thing is determined by the useful labor required to produce and get it." It adds that this would be true "if every mountain should pour forth a stream of gold."

Now, it seems obvious to me that if mountain streams poured forth gold free to the public that could be had for the dipping, that the amount of labor involved in "producing and getting" gold would become so small that the relative value of gold to other commodities would be very considerably different from the relative value of to-day. In other words, prices would rise.

An ounce of gold coins into a $20 gold piece, and that $20 piece exchanges to-day for, say, about 20 bushels of wheat. Why? Simply because taking one thing with another the amount of labor required to "produce and get" an ounce of gold is about the same as that required to "produce and get" 20 bushels of wheat. But if mountain streams ran gold and the labor required to get an ounce of gold became practically nothing, then does anyone suppose that the wheat growers would continue exchanging their 20 bushels of wheat for an ounce of gold? Not at all.

If so, most wheat farmers would rush to the banks of the mountain streams to dip out gold in order to exchange it for wheat rather than laboriously raise it. No farmer would raise wheat himself if he knew he could with practically no labor dip up gold from the stream and exchange it for his neighbor's wheat.

Wheat prices would rise until labor costs of wheat and gold had readjusted themselves to the new conditions.

Mountain streams are not yet running with liquid gold, but there is no question but that in the last ten years the amount of labor required to produce an ounce of gold compared with the labor required to produce 20 bushels of wheat has decreased very much. Therefore, wheat is higher in price.

The "Appeal" says that wheat to-day is produced with less labor per bushel than ever before. True enough, but gold is produced with still less labor, comparatively speaking. The improvements in gold production have exceeded those of wheat production.

Wages are paid in money having a gold basis, consequently a man who gets the same wages to-day that he got ten years ago is getting at least 15 per cent. less in purchasing capacity than he was. In other words, his *real* wages have decreased 15 per cent.

What has become of this 15 per cent.? Obviously it has not gone into thin air. Not at all, the 15 per cent. has gone to swell the share of the product taken by the capitalist class.

The decreased value of gold has automatically forced the working class to transfer 15 per cent. of their wages to the capitalists, and this partially accounts for the enormous increase of the accumulations of the rich in the last ten years.

True enough the workers by strikes have in some instances managed to get part of this 15 per cent. back, but as a whole it may be said that so far it is a dead loss to the vast majority.

Theoretically, by the iron law of wages the workers are bound to insist upon real wages corresponding to what they regard as their necessary standard of life; but, unfortunately, economic friction prevents readjustments being made very rapidly. In fact, so slow is the process that very often the workers meanwhile reduce their estimate of the necessary standard of life and never get back ground they may lose.

It is customary to argue that the increased production of gold is accountable for the increase of prices. This is not true, it is the decreased cost of gold.

While it is true that there has been a large increase of production of gold, yet it is equally true that if this increased production had been the result of increased demand, and had been accompanied by no discovery of the cyanide process, we might easily have seen a largely increased production of gold accompanied by a fall of prices. The increased production would have been made at a greater expenditure of labor cost per ounce of gold than previously.

An increase of production of any commodity as a general rule means a decreased cost per unit, but this is not necessarily the case.

A small town may take its water from a convenient local supply at a cost of one cent per unit. The town may grow to a city and be forced to go 50 miles for its supply, and the cost may mount to two cents per unit, notwithstanding that the total supply is much larger than it was before.

Eggs are much higher to-day than a few years ago, and yet the production of eggs has largely increased.

Taft is now calling for an international conference upon the subject of the world-wide rise in prices. No doubt Taft sees that the real reason is the decreased cost of gold, and he thinks that if this could be shown to the American people that they would not be so insistent upon destroying Trusts and reducing tariffs.

Probably this is true; but, on the other hand, he should remember that if the people understood economics better they would give up tinkering with the tariff and the currency and Trusts, for they would see that the cause of poverty lies in the private ownership of the means of production.

It is a good thing for the class Taft represents that the people are ignorantly blaming the Trusts and the tariff rather than the capitalist system itself.

Ignorance of the people is what elects the Tafts and Roosevelts.

Lloyd George's Insurance Bill

The Bill as now passed by Parliament requires the worker to pay 8 cents per week, and for this it gives him $2.40 per week for 26 weeks' illness and $1.20 per week thereafter as long as he is disabled from work. It also gives him a free doctor and free medicine, and $7.20 to help along with the expenses at the time of his wife giving birth to a child. There are also very lenient arrangements as to delinquency in arrears of payments. It is almost impossible for a worker to forfeit his insurance through involuntary non-payment of premiums.

The large benefits of the Bill compared with the small payment of 8 cents per week are accountable to the fact that the State contributes an additional 4 cents and the employers 6 cents more, making the total premium really 18 cents per week.

The Bill is of great complexity, and no doubt there are many features of detail that might be improved upon.

Also, from the Socialist point of view the worker is already getting too small a wage to be called upon to contribute even 8 cents per week, or any other sum, to the premium fund.

However, it seems to me that even taking it at the worst—namely, that the 8 cents per week can only be paid at the expense of less food for the workers—I would say that the resultant of $2.40 per week during illness would quite offset any loss.

Certainly there are thousands of workers in England to-day who pay far more than 8 cents per week to their friendly societies in order to get a benefit of $2.40 per week, and there can be no question but that, in their judgment at any rate, the stinting that they may do to pay in their insurance premium is money well spent.

Not only is the receipt of a weekly insurance payment during illness a preventative of physical deterioration to the worker and his family, but it is also calculated to be an immense protection against the moral deterioration which ensues to the absolutely destitute. Charity covers many sins, and it also kills many souls—kills the souls of both givers and receivers.

Lloyd George does not defend the principle of the workers contributing. He simply declares that with the present attitude of the House of Commons towards Labor legislation that if he had not made the Bill partly contributory he could not have got it through at all. It was that or nothing, and for his part he thinks the Bill much better than nothing, and with this I am sure most American Socialists will agree.

The English Socialists have possibly a better light upon what might have been done by George than falls on me; perhaps he could have passed a non-contributory Bill without courting political destruction. It must be remembered that there are only 42 Labor Party members out of the 670 members of the House of Commons, and outside of these there are very few who would have voted for a non-contributory Bill. However, very often, owing to political considerations, the House will pass a Bill that is not only in advance of the majority of the members but also of the electors.

Woman Suffrage is certainly of that order of Bills. Notwithstanding the majority it commands in the House, I doubt if it is really a Bill that commends itself to all those who vote for it. Many a member feels that he must vote for it or suffer political extinction.

That it would fail of commanding a majority of the popular vote if a Referendum were taken is admitted by practically everyone. Therefore, when it is proposed to take a Referendum upon woman suffrage there are no more strenuous opposers of this manner of settling the question than the suffragists. They denounce the suggestion as emanating from enemies who are too cowardly to oppose is openly. And no doubt the women are right. One of the great differences between politics in America and in England is that whereas progressive legislation has a far better chance in America when left to a Referendum, in England it would have a much worse chance.

The Irish would never get Home Rule if the question were left to a popular vote of all Great Britain. That is admitted by the Irish themselves.

However, to return to the Insur-

ance Bill, while I can see that a non-contributory Bill would be a better Bill than the present one, I cannot see that Lloyd George is not right in declaring that the present Bill is the best he could do.

From a tactical standpoint no doubt it is good politics for the Socialists to denounce the Bill, and every other Bill which is proposed or passed by any party not a Socialist Party; but that is another story.

However, the Bill is now a law, and has largely passed the stage of political controversy. It will stand upon its practical results, and what those results are we will know very shortly.

I doubt if any party in the future would dare repeal the Bill, for I think it will be too strongly intrenched in the minds of the people as one step toward social justice. A feeble and halting step, maybe, but still a step. And a step far greater, by the way, than America has yet thought of making.

Certainly the German Socialist Party has never asked the repeal of the Bismarckian Insurance Laws, which are both far more onerous in the contributions demanded from the workers and far less generous in benefits.

For the British workers to regain the 8 cents per week they must pay by a few well-managed strikes is a mere nothing. The British sailors last summer, although they had practically no organization worth speaking of, gained $2.40 per week advance by a strike lasting less than ten days.

Coal Strike in England

As we go to press a big coal strike, taking in all the British mines, is brewing.

The men demand a minimum wage of about $1.25 per day for lowest paid labor; they already have the eight-hour day.

It does not seem possible but that they will get what they demand, and that without a strike. The threat should be sufficient. The day is past when England can allow the mine-owners to bring the nation to such crisis as that involved by a general coal strike when the demand on the part of the men meets with such popular approval.

The minimum wage is undoubtedly one of the reforms that is coming for all industries in every country.

The Wilshire Gold Mines

I HAVE no gold mine stock for sale. What I have I am satisfied to hold for myself.

I feel called upon to say this publicly as a general reply to the great number of inquiries provoked by the publication in the January "Wilshire's" of such a favorable report upon the Bishop Creek Mine by no less an authority than Mr. E. W. Walter.

The report was published not to sell stock, but as a sufficient and crushing rejoinder to certain fools who can find no better argument against Socialism than lying about Socialists.

They are of the order of asses who would disprove the theory of evolution by alleging that Darwin stole sheep.

However, it takes all sorts of men to make up a big Socialist vote, and as the vote of a fool cancels that of a wise man I have therefore always felt that, quite irrespective of any personal consideration, I should endeavour to prove to the public that the mines in which I am interested were all right.

Of course there are some men who on general principles think all Socialists knaves, and there are also some "extra-pure" Socialists who appear to agree with this verdict against their own compatriots.

In order to assure Socialists that the Bishop Creek Mine was all right I asked a number of well-known Socialists who had been on the mine to state what they knew about it. They did so, and the "extra-pures" merely derided them as either nincompoops who had no brains or as knaves who had sold themselves to Wilshire. Tommy-rot, so to speak.

Some of the "extra-pures" are now "extra" the Socialist Party, expelled to a purer atmosphere.

I had Mr. Walter, a man whose good judgment and honesty no one can impeach, report for the general public.

The Bishop Creek Mine was inaugurated by me on the basis that at $5 a ton we would have a profitable mine. Mr. Walter reports, however, that the values average $13.30. Last month we sent a carload of ore to the Custom smelter at Hazen, Nevada, and sold it upon the basis of a valuation of $19.40 the ton.

Herewith are copies of letters from the smelter company to Mr. Lodge, our agent, and from Banker Watterson, who knows the Bishop Mine from frequent personal inspection:—

Western Ore Purchasing Company
Purchasers of Gold, Silver, Lead and Copper Ore

Hazen, Nevada,
Dec. 22, 1911.

P. E. Lodge, Esq., Agent,
Wilshire Bishop Creek Mine,
Bishop, California

Dear Sir,

We are herewith enclosing our cheque for $165.41, being net proceeds of your car of ore, weight 35,760 lbs, at $19.40 per ton.

We deducted 5% loss in smelting and $5 per ton for freight and $4 per ton for the treatment.

Hoping that the results are satisfactory and to again receive your shipments,

Very truly,
Western Ore Purchasing Co.

Inyo County Bank
W. W. Watterson, President
Bishop, Inyo Co., Cal.

Jan. 17, 1912.

Gaylord Wilshire, Esq.,
London, England

Dear Sir,

We wish to congratulate you on the results of the carload shipment of ore you have just received returns on from the smelter.

On all that has been done to demonstrate the value of the Bishop Creek Gold Mines, there is nothing which speaks so well for the property as this ore shipment. Expert reports, mine assays, etc., are valuable and necessary to the men on the ground and in close touch with the property, but actual smelter returns of $20 00 per ton on ore, just as it is taken from the face of the drift, mean things to mining men, especially when it comes from a vein measured by feet and not inches.

It will be one of the big mines of the West, and I expect to see a thousand men working on that vein some day.

Hoping that you will be able to have the stamps dropping on Bishop Creek ore before another summer rolls around,

I am, yours very truly,
W. W. Watterson,
President.

As said, I have no mining stock for sale; the stockholders are so well satisfied with the Bishop Creek Mine that they are building the mill themselves without asking any help from anyone.

As to my South American mines, I would say we have pro-

duced $294,000 in bullion, as officially attested by the British Guiana Government. Nevertheless, I have found that without additional capital and equipment they cannot be profitably worked.

Having resolved not to ask the stockholders for further money, and in view of the great uncertainty and difficulty in getting aid in the open market for mines in the tropics, I am offering my stockholders to exchange their stock for Bishop Creek stock.

Gorky and the Russian Spies

It may be remembered, some years ago when the Russian novelist Maxim Gorky while over in this country as my guest at the Hotel Belleclaire, in New York, that the "New York World," as usual, always ready to blacken any man's reputation if it can sell an extra dozen papers, published a scare-head story to the effect that Gorky had deserted his wife and children in Russia and was palming off an actress here as his wife. The story had some basis. Russia grants no divorces to the unorthodox, hence the custom is to separate by mutual consent, such separations having the moral standing of a divorce with us.

Col. V. Nicolaeff, late chief of the Russian Foreign Spies, has a long story translated by Ivan Narodny in the "Monthly Magazine" section of the Philadelphia "North American" of December 10, in which he confesses that the "World" story was a plant laid by the Russian Government.

Russia heard that Gorky was coming to America in order to raise funds for the Russian Revolution, which at that time was in full fire, and they wished to discredit him.

They furnished the details of the story to the "World," and the photographs of the so-called abandoned wife and children.

Nicolaeff goes on to say:—

It will startle the average American to learn that various noted Russian refugees, particularly Maxim Gorky, failed to find the open door in New York and Washington, and in society, entirely because of the machinations of the system for which I worked.

The Gorky scandal, I confess with shame, was partly of my instigation. Trepoff, who succeeded Plehve, after the latter's assassination by Sosonoff, wrote me from St. Petersburg that he had heard that Gorky, who was then in Helsingfors, intended to tour Europe and America, and make a personal appeal for the revolutionary cause. He, therefore, directed me to do all I could to discredit him.

We learned that Gorky and Andrieva were to be the guests of Mr. Wilshire, a Socialist, at the Hotel Belleclaire.

The second day after Gorky's arrival, there was a report that a dinner was to be given by his countrymen at Number 3 Fifth Avenue, and that among the guests were to be Mark Twain, William Dean Howells, Arthur Brisbane and many others.

Meanwhile, Baron Rosen in Washington did his diplomatic best to influence President Roosevelt not to receive Gorky. Miss J., an ardent Russian sympathiser, had gone to Washington to pave the way for Gorky's reception at the White House. The President seemed then to be very sympathetic, and said he would be glad to meet Gorky, Tchaikovsky and Narodny. The next day, however, Miss J. was told that the President had seen the Russian Ambassador and had decided that it would not be proper to see the revolutionary emissaries.

The dinner to Gorky at Number 3 Fifth Avenue took place.

The Wilshire reception at the Belleclaire also took place. There were present a large number of literary people, many reporters, and last, but not least, several spies. The latter were not idle. Furthermore, I have reason to suppose that other Russian agents in Europe had arranged for the sending to a New York paper of a cable from London, full of discrediting gossip. The fuse was lighted, and there followed the explosion. The story I had prepared in Berlin appeared, and the result was that Gorky and Andrieva were turned out of their hotel, and were glad to get a room in the apartments of a friend. Here they remained, until they secretly moved over to the home of a Mr. Martin, in Staten Island. These are the details of the great Gorky scandal, which not only humiliated Gorky personally, but which also changed the attitude of European literary circles toward the New World. It was thus that American conventionality became a weapon for the Russian department of espionage.

The interesting part of this confession to me is the disclosure that the "New York World" was merely a tool of the Russian autocracy.

Berger's Old Age Bill

Victor Berger, the one and only Socialist member of Congress, has introduced an Old Age Pension Bill which provides that every person, with a certain few exceptions, who is 60 years of age, and who has been a citizen for 16 years, shall be entitled to $4 per week if there is no other additional income of over $6 per week. If his or her income exceeds $6 per week, then there are a series of provisions reducing the $4 pension proportionately.

There is also rather a puzzling provision that if a husband and wife are not divorced and are living together that instead of their pensions being $4 each they shall be but $3 each.

Of course, the Bill will never pass, and probably never emerge from the committee where it is now buried. A Bill like that drawn up by John Doe, of Doeville, would have more chance of passage than one proposed by a Socialist.

Berger warned the House that "within a year a mighty wave would be rolling in on them from all parts of the country demanding the passage of some Bill like this."

However, if there is any Pension Bill to be passed we may be sure that the Democrats will never allow any Socialist to take the kudos, not as long as they have a majority.

But Berger is right, Pension Bills are in the air, and may alight any time; but, meanwhile, it seems to me that as a matter of policy his Bill might have been more generous and a little simpler. It should merely provide that all citizens should have at 60 years of age a pension of $1 per day.

No man can live on $4 per week; it is cruelty to deliberately ask them to try to do so. Sherwood, in his $30 per month Old Soldier Bill gauged sentiment on this point correctly.

A dollar a day is certainly the minimum that a Socialist should *ask* for; he might take whatever he can get.

Then, I think it neither good Socialism nor good policy for Berger to fine a married couple $2 per week merely because they happen to live together. Seems to me that, if anything, they should get $2 extra in these troublesome days of the divorce problem.

His deductions on account of "other income" may be all right for a final Bill that is up for actual passage, but they cumber the naked principle. I would have let the House itself, if the Bill ever emerges from committee, propose such encumberment by amendments.

What is wanted now is assent to the principle of an old age pension, and not debate on detail.

Probably the trusts allowed the postal banks to be started just to find out whether or not the ultimate consumer has any change left.—"Danville Commercial News."

Stephenson's managers assert that there was no vote-buying. They merely spent the money and depended upon the voters' sense of courtesy for an adequate return.—"Los Angeles Tribune."

British Bishops on Labor

The "Christian Commonwealth," London

Bishops of the Church of England appear to be vieing with one another in blessing the Labor movement, and expressing their sympathy with its main aspirations and aims. In our last issue Mr. Snowden referred to the Diocesan address of the Archbishop of York, who described "with force and eloquence that no Socialist orator could surpass" the existing contrasts of wealth and poverty, of luxury and squalor, and of idleness and hardship. A few days later the Bishop of Oxford, addressing the Workers' Educational Association at Manchester, spoke of the "victory" which he held to be "the legitimate aspiration" of the Labor movement. He had, he remarked, a strong and decided opinion on the Labor movement in the industrial world. "It is," Dr. Gore said, "that, looking at the matter on the largest scale, in the vast industrial development which has characterised the recent advances of our civilisation, labor has had a wholly inadequate share of the profits. As a believer in the revelation of divine righteousness which is to be found in the Bible I believe that the first charge upon industry is the proper payment of the labourer—not the last charge, the first charge. I believe also that the acceptance of that principle would be not the death of industrial progress, but its new life, because if it might discourage a few it would encourage very many." At the Hereford Diocesan Conference the Bishop of Hereford declared that on the Church's attitude to the working classes and to the great Nonconformist bodies would largely depend whether the Church of England was in the future to be really the national Church or was to be in effect denationalised and to become a mere sect of denominations. "The aims and aspirations," he said, "of the working multitudes and their leaders lie in the direction of Socialism. An educated proletariat or working class is a new phenomenon in history, and it is not likely to remain satisfied with the present individualist organisation of industry and commence and all its glaring inequalities. Consequently we may take it as certain that the present condition of things will gradually give place to some form of Socialist organisation, or to individualism largely modified by Socialism. It will be beyond measure unfortunate if Church people, lay and clerical, range themselves in opposition to this uprising of the people, as we are in some danger of doing." Such utterances as these suggest what a complete and rapid transformation would be effected in the condition of England if all our right reverend fathers in God, acting in the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth, made themselves the friends and spokesmen of the "common people."

Blessed Word Regulation

If you wish to see the fallacy of Regulating the Trust as now advocated by Progressive Teddy send us a 2 cent stamp for a pamphlet, "That Blessed Word Regulation," by Chas. Edward Russell.

Somewhere Mr. Taft is speaking.—"New York American."

A Cement Gun

"Daily Trade Report"

"The cement gun is manufactured by a New York company, and consists of an air-compressor, a 4-cylinder marine gasoline engine of 20 h.p., a 1-inch wire-wound rubber hose with walls three-eighths inch thick for delivering dry sand and cement mixed, an ordinary garden hose for delivering water to the nozzle of the gun, and the gun or nozzle itself. . . .

"A mixture (1 to 2½) of cement and fine sand is delivered to the nozzle at 30 pounds pressure, and just before being discharged is met by a circular spray of water at 30 pounds pressure within the nozzle, so that the wet mortar is projected on the surface to be covered. The water supply is regulated at nozzle to obtain the correct consistency.

"Triangular mesh is secured by staples to the studding of the structure, and is backed up by either heavy paper or wood placed so that the mesh will be in the centre of the mass of stucco 1¼ inches in thickness when the spraying is completed. In dwelling-houses the stucco is placed on the studding inside as well as outside, but is made only about three-fourths inch thick inside. Smoothing is done by shooting a fine light spray of wet mortar. No finishing is done with the trowel. The finished surface inside is to be painted. The resulting stucco is very hard and makes a fair appearance, though it is necessarily rough. . . .

"At this date (August 9) one gun is placing 90 square yards, 1¼ inches thick, per working day. The cost at present, including cost of studding and backing in place, is $1.13 per square yard."

Pensions for Mothers

"The Public"

Under the Illinois law, any poor mother may now receive a pension to aid her in bringing up her children. She is under no obligation to amiable persons of philanthropic instincts and means, nor to charity societies or church or other private associations. She gets the money as a right, and not as a favor, out of the public treasury into which she pays money, whether she knows it or not, as a direct-taxpayer or an indirect-taxpayer. The pension is paid to her for bringing up her children at home, as money is paid to teachers for bringing them up at school. The families of dead workers and those of poor convicts will not any longer be doomed to destruction where this law applies. The family home, not the charity institution, is the ideal of this law. May its principles progress until, out of the abundance which belongs to society but which goes now to individuals unearned, all families are thus provided for—but better.

New York is to spend $33,000,000 on education next year. It needs every cent of it.—"Philadelphia Inquirer."

John D. Rockefeller got his first and only job fifty-six years ago, and has just been celebrating the event. The men who lost their jobs because Mr. Rockefeller did not stick to his have not had their celebration yet.—"New York World."

Perhaps the Trusts would feel safer in jail.—"Wall Street Journal."

Steel and the Man

"The following verses by Charles Buxton Going in 'Hampton's Magazine' illustrate the new function of poetry,' says "Current Literature." "The poet has heard the voice of the rails and the wires. He celebrates their powers, but there is the fear in his heart that modern man may be the slave of the industrial Frankensteins whom he has called into being:—

Shot and furnace and forge—
Thus have ye set me free
On the roadway that leaps the gorge
And the ship as it takes the sea!

"God through infinite ages had given me rest;
Yours was the forest, the flint, the girdle of skin.
But primal lord of the beasts, were ye cursed or blest
When ye called me out of my slumber to serve your kin?

For what ye have launched ye mus ride;
Whither it tends ye must fare.
The choice ye have made ye mnst bide—
Ye perish, unless ye dare!

"That which ye think in your inmost souls, I do—
Build, or shatter; till, or ravage the land.
I am the sword, and I am the scalpel, too—
Unto your fertile brain, the tireless hand.

That I have grasped, ye must hold;
That which ye hold, ye must use.
Ye chose one to serve you, of old—
Now, are ye free to choose?

"The work ye plan and I do may raven your soul;
The pace ye set and I take ye never can drop.
Fast and yet faster I drive—but whither the goal?
Stopping were chaos: but what if ye do not stop?

Iron of hand and of heel,
Speeding the engines of fate,
Ye have wrought out a world of steel
Ye are helpless to uncreate!

Francisco Ferrer

To the Editor, "Daily Chronicle"

I have not seen any mention in the English Press of a noteworthy fact which has just come to my knowledge, namely, that the Supreme (Civil) Court of Madrid has practically reversed the judgment of the Barcelona Council of War, and declared the innocence of Francisco Ferrer. The Court declares: (1) that Ferrer was not concerned in the Barcelona disturbances; (2) that none of the rioters who were prosecuted acted under his orders; (3) that in none of the 2,000 prosecutions arising out of the riots was any trace discovered of Ferrer's participation or inspiration. The Court, therefore, orders the restitution to his heirs of his confiscated property. This news is communicated to a Belgian paper by one of Ferrer's executors, and there seems to be no reason to doubt its authenticity. It confirms what some of us had already suspected—that the King of Spain's recent act of clemency indicated an uneasy conscience with regard to Ferrer.

WILLIAM ARCHER.

London, January 26.

Printed for the Proprietors by the Twentieth Century Press Limited (Trade Union and 48 Hours), 37a, Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.